Case 2:11-cv-07414-JP Document 1 Filed 12/01/11 Page 1 of 9

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS				
JOSEPH and LINDA HOUCK			i	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff			County of	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant				
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Nu	mber and Email Add	ress)	er intrant	ID COMPENDE	TON GARRA II	00 TUD 1 00 100	YOU OF THE
Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 30 E. Butler Pike			Attorneys (I	LAND	ID CONDEMNA INVOLVED.	ATION CASES, U	SE THE LOCATI	ON OF THE
Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888			+					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	ı One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSI	IIP OF P	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in C	One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N		(For Diversity Citizen of This State	Cases Only) P	TF DEF	Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi	and One Box fincipal Place	
D 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity(Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another S	tate 🗇	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and I of Business In A		5 5 5
			Citizen or Subject of	а 🗇	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		0606
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Γ (Di "Y" :- O D O		Foreign Country					
CONTRACT		TS	FORFEITURE/	ENALTY	I BANK	KRUPTCÝ	OTHER	STATUTES
□ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 755 Motor Vehicle ☐ 760 Other Personal Injury ☐ 341 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities — Employment ☐ 650 Employment ☐ 651 Employment ☐ 652 Employment ☐ 653 Employment ☐ 654 Employment ☐ 655 Employment ☐ 655 Employment ☐ 655 Employment ☐ 656 Employment ☐ 657 Employment ☐ 657 Employment ☐ 657 Employment ☐ 657 Employment ☐ 658 Employment ☐ 6	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 530 General 5315 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights	G20 Other Food & G25 Drug Related of Property 2 G30 Liquor Laws G40 R.R. & Truck G50 Airline Regs. G60 Occupational Safety/Healt G90 Other Labor Mgmt. T30 Labor/Mgmt. T30 Labor/Mgmt. T30 Labor/Mgmt. T40 Railway Labor T40	Seizure USC 881 andards Relations Reporting Act r Act citigation c. ION Application s -	422 Appea 423 Withdi	1 28 USC 158 'awal C 157 FYRIGHTS ghts mark ECURITY 395ff) Lung (923) DIWW (405(g)) Fitte XVI D5(g)) TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff endant) Fhird Party	400 State Rd 410 Antitrus 430 Banks a 450 Comme 450 Comme 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/S 810 Selectivi Exchang 875 Custom 12 USC 890 Other S 891 Agriculti 892 Econom 893 Envirol 894 Energy 895 Freedon Act 900Appeal c	eapportionment st and Banking erce ation er Influenced and Organizations ner Credit dat TV ex Service des/Commodities/ ge er Challenge or Challenge or Stabilization Act numental Matters Allocation Act n of Information of Fee Determination equal Access dese
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 Rei	te Court A	ppellate Court	4 Reinstated or Reopened	anothe (specif	fy)	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation	ct 🗇 7 N	Appeal to District udge from Aagistrate udgment
WE CATION ON LOWE	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu	ite under which you are	filing (Do not cite ju	risdictiona	ıl statutes unl	ess diversity):		H
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cause Hair Debt Collect	se: tion Practices Act			**************************************			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		S A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$			ECK YES only i	f demanded in a	complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE	(See instructions):	UDGE			DOCKET	NUMBER		***************************************
Explanation:								
DATE		SIGNATURE OF	ATTORNEY OF RE	CORD		······································	·····	
12/01/2011		/s/ Craig Thor						

Case 2:11-cv-074/NFIED STATE POISTRE COUNTIL Page 2 of 9

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.					
Address of Plaintiff: 124 Johns Lane, New Castle, PA 16102					
Address of Defendant: 507 Production Road, Horsham, PA 19044					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
(Use Reverse Side For A	• •				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a					
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No □				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No No				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number:	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one ye					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior s action in this court?	Yes□ No □ No □ within one year previously terminated				
	Yes No No				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier n					
terminated action in this court?	Yes No No				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	s case filed by the same individual?				
	Yes No No				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. ☐ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury				
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please				
7. E. Civil Pinks	specify)				
7. ☐ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability				
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$ 1697	(Please specify)				
(Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERTI					
I, Caia Mor Kimme (Check Appropriate Cal	tegory) r:				
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of					
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
11 .010	n a 1				
DATE: 12/1/2011 /S/CRUGTNON FUM	<u> </u>				
Attornby-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	Attorney I.D.# e has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or we except as noted above.	rithin one year previously terminated action in this court				
121/201					
DATE: 15 MONTH	wee				
Attomey-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV. 609 (6/08)

Case 2:11-cv-07414-JP Document 1 Filed 12/01/11 Page 3 of 9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

)	oseph and Linda v.	a Houch		CIVIL ACTION	
	v.				
	NCO Financial S	ystems, The.		NO.	
	In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.				
	SELECT ONE OF THE I	FOLLOWING CASE	MANAGEMEN	Γ TRACKS:	
	(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	s brought under 28 U.S	S.C. § 2241 throug	th § 2255.	()
	(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()				
	(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (X)				
	(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.				
	(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special				
	management cases.)		1		()
	(f) Standard Management	– Cases that do not fal	ll into any one of the	he other tracks.	()
	12/1/2011 Date	•		seph and Beverly Houce Attorney for	
	715-540-8888	877-788-28	764	Kimmel @creditlaws	com
	Telephone	FAX Number		E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOSEPH and LINDA HOUCK,)
Plaintiffs)
v.) Case No.:
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
Defendant) JURY TRIAL)

COMPLAINT

JOSEPH and LINDA HOUCK ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., allege the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs' Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiffs are natural persons residing in New Castle, Pennsylvania.
- 6. Plaintiffs are each a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Also, Plaintiffs are persons granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiffs in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Beginning on or about May 1, 2011, and continuing through November 16, 2011, Defendant and others it retained constantly and continuously placed harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiffs seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt.
- 12. Upon information and belief, the debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 13. Defendant and its employees harassed Plaintiffs by making continuous and repeated telephone calls to their home telephone.
- 14. Defendant contacted Plaintiffs, on average, once a day, causing Plaintiffs to receive approximately twenty (20) collection calls a month.
- 15. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiffs on November 14, 2011; November 15, 2011; and November 16, 2011.

- 16. When contacting Plaintiffs, upon information and belief, Defendant used prerecorded messages, making it difficult, if not impossible, for Plaintiffs to speak with a live person about the alleged debt.
- 17. Furthermore, within five (5) days of its initial communication with Plaintiffs, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiffs written notification of their rights to dispute the debt, to request verification of the debt, or with the name of the creditor.
- 18. To date, Plaintiffs have not received any written notification from Defendant regarding their rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt or with the name of the creditor.
- 19. The repetitive calls to Plaintiffs were disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy.

CONSTRUCTION OF LAW

- 20. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 21. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

7

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

25

24

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

22. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 23. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiffs in connection with the collection of a debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiffs' home telephone to ring, and engaged Plaintiffs in conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiffs;

- d. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt; and
- e. Defendant violated §1692g(a) of the FDCPA when it failed to send Plaintiffs written notification within five (5) days of its initial communication, or to make in its initial communication with Plaintiffs, of their rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, JOSEPH and LINDA HOUCK, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiffs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs, JOSEPH and LINDA HOUCK, demand a jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Date: <u>12/1/2011</u>

By: /s/ Craig Thor Kimmel (CTK 3654)

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID No. 57100 Tara L. Patterson Attorney ID No. 88343 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

5

Case 2:11-cv-07414-JP Document 1 Filed 12/01/11 Page 9 of 9

Email: <u>kimmel@creditlaw.com</u>
Email: <u>tpatterson@creditlaw.com</u>